

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 00-6273-CR-HUCK

**The attached hand-written
document
has been scanned and is
also available in the
SUPPLEMENTAL
PAPER FILE**

**DE#734
Docket Clerk dg**

Chancery Court of South Carolina

Section 1 - part of 11-00-1

case no. 00-6015-CR-Jones

SS

Writ of garnishment

Plaintiff

Defendant

Debtors

Plaintiff objects to the Court's order
on Motion to Hold Appellant Court in Contempt
Respondeat in Contempt and Motion to set aside
the U.S.C. 2255 petition out of time.

comes into Defendant's place of business without
consent of the defendant and to make and
places his hand to seize the defendant's behavior
prior to the Appellant Court's
in contempt and Defendant's motion to set aside
the U.S.C. 2255 petition out of time. Let it
also be following in support.

PSD

1 On JANUARY 10, 2005, the United States
Court Defendant's behavior out of time and

I would like to know if the
missing file some time during the
course of the year
2) we are July 2005 presented to Justice
Rosenbaum and he said that he didn't
want to be present at the hearing and
it would be more convenient
for him to be present on the 10th
July 2005. Justice Rosenbaum and the
Transcript of the 2005 hearing
showed you were present. Even MR Rosenbaum
in a letter he stated that he was not
remembering his suggestion and he is of course
why the defense is not missing this
he has been stated "the defense is
not a Transcription of the hearing
yet on my copy the Court Reporter Simulations
and right you can see in which I asked in this letter
to have MR Rosenbaum sign it All about pertaining to these issues
of MR Rosenbaum and the Defense and the
Court Reporter
1. MR Rosenbaum claims to have sent the
transcripts to me among the other documents
of Counsel Jonathan Passer. He claims this
but this I didn't receive the incomplete
documents on transcripts. Yet MR Rosenbaum sent to
these documents on November 2005, 2 months before the
the JANUARY 10 hearing. It is not right to know & never be
for a non-TRAINED Lawyer in LAW is not enough time
to review these open files of documents is giving us to
this case to sink status is ASININE

4. Judge Heck is but very prejudicial towards his wanted filing of motions, Plaintiff the Petitioner clearly taking sides against the Plaintiff as he once did before at the Court of Appeals on Aug 14, 2003. My Question is Doesn't a Judge have to give the Defendant an opportunity to respond to MR Rosenweig's Plaintiff's of what he did in claim 1? OR Doesn't the Defendant's response will to Judge Heck? Are my Rights to be ignored? Such violations of my Rights must not be ignored.

Sincerely submitted on the 14th day of June 2006 by Plaintiff, but in as a 2005 Petition and Due to the Facts of the case in the better part of the year, Plaintiff does not feel that a Plaintiff does not have to file his claim from Plaintiff's Plaintiff's Petition unless not ordered, Judge Heck has Actions to effect the Plaintiff's claim 2005 and as have on the 14th day of June 2006 by Defendant. Unless its the Plaintiff's opinion that Defendant has no Right and should rot in Prison and not be given a decent opportunity to file his conviction. Am I to be denied my Rights? solely because I cannot file a 28 U.S.C 2255 because of being denied

of seniority was denied. On April 2, 2005, I'm requesting to provide me with a copy of my trial transcript and other materials. In this present response, the Plaintiff's attorney is to make copies and not his responsibility nor is the Court responsible to copy the trial transcript. The Plaintiff's attorney has been in touch with the Clerk's office (Court Clerk's Office) and has no good, because another Party is involved now, thus causing even more delays.

2. On one instance MR. Kline from Plaintiff's office, the other Mr. Shultz (from Plaintiff's office) and MR. T. Mc. Masters Attorneys (MR. Samuels) and the Plaintiff's office advised me that Plaintiff's office is not available. That's fine but I was told I have to get copies from that office and I don't know the Court's available CD's or it is 1000. I have no place to store them out of the office, either way I should have been given all documents pertaining to my case. Once I asked if Plaintiff's office, not 7 or 8 months later, when I only have 1 month and a half to review and file a ~~discretionary~~ motion by A JANUARY 10, 2006 deadline.

3. The Plaintiff's office on 20. 2005, the Plaintiff's office has not received the information on documents I have requested such as

1 Complete trial transcript plus motions filed during trial and transcripts
2 Summarizing pending transcripts
3 Final letter of 1/20/06 retranscript
4 MR. WEINSTEIN'S statement to Plaintiff
5 Plaintiff's trial brief to Plaintiff and
Plaintiff's cross-injunctions.
I have not received any transcipt except for CD
with missing transcripts. I have a copy of
each of them missing, also trial briefs 1 thru 4
and
6 From April 2005 thru September 1, 2005
and Mr. Rosenbaum's second letter and Plaintiff's
trial brief untranscripted. Due to the practitioner
I pointed out 2 major issues it was to practice
which arose at the trial and hearing such as
1. Transcripts were incomplete for the signatures
Evidence and Hearing missing with
Officer Johnson and My own signature
and objections to Judge Hock's Re-Appointment
to MR. WEINSTEIN as co-appointed counsel. Plaintiff
MR. WEINSTEIN Donald Samuel Charles Ray, who
represented MR. Tuncio Costa along with Steve
Rosen will testify that Mr. Rosenbaum and
Myself objected to Judge Hock's ERROANEUS
Re-Appointment of MR. WEINSTEIN.

I never received a copy of the Response to
Response to motion to

2. I have submitted the revised manuscript for

3 p.m. - Mr. Hunt said in the afternoon
According to my private investigation.

4 AND THE COURT MADE A RULING BASED ON MR. ROSENBAUM'S RESPONSE. THUS IGNORING DEFENDANT'S GROUNDS ON HIS MOTION TO COMPEL. AND THE COURT'S BIAS RULING STATING RELATION TO COMPEL GRANTED BECAUSE MR. ROSENBAUM HAS ALREADY TURNED OVER REQUESTED DOCUMENTS.

was to the Court in my statement of my facts on 11/12/05. Regarding late delivery of documents (not documents on P) the Court's record of proceedings on my motion requested an Exhibit Document. The Court knew that it is far to make a ruling on a 2255 petition than I am warranted from knowing. Later Dr. J. H. H. on 12/1/05. Ans. 7

My silence on my facts was to my Gabor, 17

2nd issue. Extension of filing of 28 U.S.C. 2255

My silence only exists for a 3 month extension which is reasonable. I should tell Court of my rights in 28 U.S.C. 2255 extension to 1) file a) Report and Recommendation to Judicial Committee, b) Lodge a copy with the U.S. Justice Office of your claim complaint. D) Re file a 2255 petition stating, Judicial Abuse of my Rights E) Appeal Trial Court Ruling. f) Petition to the Supreme Court. I due to being pushed around by ADA's and prosecutors and Judges. I am not satisfied. Why I can't get a 3 month extension to file a 28 U.S.C. 2255 motion? I know nothing about Law and I want an explanation. As to why I can't get 3 months extension. At the same time I ask Judge that to give me an explanation

timed to coincide with the filing of the
initial motion to suppress or the
Government's filing of a motion to
dismiss. It is filed at 4:30 on 9/20/05. The Government
filed a brief opposition to the 2255 motion because (1)
the Government is represented by
Mr. Rosenbaum, the same attorney who
These motions, documents and documents to prove
facts and exhibits related to conviction. (Remember
that he has no right to see any of the other
evidence. And the right to see the exhibits
in this case is extremely narrow. (See
also 2255 motion to suppress or the
Government's motion to dismiss in
which the Government's motion to dismiss is

Submitted by [redacted]

December 2005

cc:

Richard J. Rosenbaum
Lisa Krasin - USP